

REMARKS

In the present Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, and 12-21 were pending before the Office. Of these, claims 1, 7, 10, and 18 were the only independent claims.

Claims 1 and 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 7-10, and 12-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

No claims are hereby added, amended, canceled, or withdrawn. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

A. THE CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OF CLAIMS 1 AND 3-6 IS CLEARLY NOT PROPER AND IS CLEARLY WITHOUT BASIS AS THE CITED REFERENCES DO NOT DISCLOSE TRANSMITTING DATA FROM THE SELECTED PIPE FLOW USING A BANDWIDTH CORRESPONDING TO THE WINNING PIPE FLOW

Claims 1 and 3-6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0081167 by Hassan-Ali et al. [hereinafter *Hassan-Ali I*] in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,020,161 to Eberle et al. [hereinafter *Eberle*]. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"When determining whether a claim is obvious, an examiner must make "a searching comparison of the claimed invention - *including all its limitations* - with the teaching of the prior art." *In re Wada and Murphy*, Appeal 2007-3733 (BPAI 2008)(citing *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1995)). "Thus, 'obviousness requires a suggestion of all limitations in a claim.'" *Id* (citing *CFMT, Inc. v. Yieldup Intern. Corp.*, 349 F.3d 1333, 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2003)(citing *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974))(emphasis added).

Independent claim 1 recites, inter alia

transmitting data from the selected pipe flow
using a bandwidth corresponding to the
winning pipe flow.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is clearly not proper and is without basis. Specifically, it is maintained that the secondary citation to *Eberle* fails to remedy the conceded deficiency in the primary citation to *Hassan-Ali I*. Accordingly, without conceding its propriety, the proposed combination of *Hassan-Ali I* and *Eberle* is likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

The Office Action concedes that the primary citation to *Hassan-Ali I* does not teach transmitting data from the selected pipe flow using a bandwidth corresponding to the winning pipe flow. *Final Office Action*, page 4. Nonetheless, the *Office Action* rejects independent claim 1, contending that the secondary citation to *Eberle* provides this necessary disclosure. *Office Action*, page 4. This contention is respectfully traversed.

Eberle relates to scheduling and allocation of resources in an electronic system. *Eberle*, col. 1, lines 29-32. *Eberle* states that

[a] precalculated schedule can accommodate isochronous traffic by allocating the necessary connection between an input and output port at intervals derived from the rate of the isochronous data stream. That way, an appropriate amount of switch bandwidth can be reserved.

The Office Action fails to establish that "isochronous traffic" equates to the expressly recited winning pipe flow. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that "isochronous traffic" does not equate to a winning pipe flow. In fact, Dictionary.com defines "isochronous" in terms appearing in contrast to a winning pipe flow: "2. Characterized by occurring at equal intervals of time." *Webster's Revised Unabridged*

Dictionary. MICRA, Inc.

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/isochronous> (accessed: January 06, 2009). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully maintain that the cited portion of *Eberle* cannot properly be relied upon for disclosing a winning pipe flow, much less transmitting data from a selected pipe flow using bandwidth corresponding to the winning pipe flow, as expressly recited in independent claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is clearly not proper and is without basis. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

B. THE CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OF CLAIMS 7-10 AND 12-21 IS CLEARLY NOT PROPER AND IS CLEARLY WITHOUT BASIS AS THE CITED REFERENCE DOES NOT DISCLOSE, FOR EXAMPLE, WRITING DATA REGARDING A PIPE FLOW TO A SECOND CALENDAR

Claims 7-10 and 12-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hassan-Ali I* in view of *Eberle* and in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0081157 to Hassan-Ali et al. [hereinafter *Hassan-Ali II*]. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 7, 10, and 18 recite, respectively:

writing data regarding the pipe flow to a second calendar;

a secondary calendar for storing pipe flows that are scheduled to be serviced; and

write data regarding the pipe flow to the second calendar[.]

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is clearly not proper and is without basis. Specifically, it is maintained that the tertiary citation to *Hassan-Ali II* fails to remedy the conceded deficiency of the citations to *Hassan-Ali I*

and *Eberle*. Accordingly, without conceding its propriety, the proposed combination of *Hassan-Ali I*, *Eberle*, and *Hassan-Ali II* is likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art. Accordingly, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

The Office Action concedes that the primary citation to *Hassan-Ali I* does not teach writing data regarding the pipe flow to a second calendar. *Office Action*, page 6. Due to Office Action's continued reliance on the tertiary reference to *Hassan-Ali II*, and based on Applicants inability to find a disclosure in *Eberle* of, for example, a "second calendar" or "secondary calendar," the Applicants continue to assume that the Office Action intended to concede that the secondary citation to *Eberle* also fails to disclose the above features. Instead, the Office Action rejects independent claims 7, 10, and 18 contending that the tertiary citation to *Hassan-Ali II* provides this necessary disclosure. *Office Action*, page 6. This contention is respectfully traversed.

Hassan-Ali II relates to "a calendar heap system and method for efficiently sorting time stamps used in an Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM) scheduling environment." *Hassan-Ali II*, para. 3.

Hassan-Ali II does not appear to even mention a second calendar, much less writing data regarding a pipe flow to a second calendar, or a secondary calendar for storing pipe flows that are scheduled to be serviced.

Applicants respectfully submit that the hybrid calendar heap scheme 500 does not equate to a second calendar. Rather, the hybrid calendar heap scheme 500 appears to be the calendar heap. Thus, assuming arguendo that the calendar heap scheme 500 is a calendar, it is at best, a first calendar (i.e., not a second calendar).

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish that the second layer of the calendar somehow equates to a second calendar. Instead, Applicants again note that the hybrid calendar heap scheme 500 appears to be the calendar heap.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is clearly not proper and is without basis. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 are respectfully requested.

C. CONCLUSION

Since Applicants assert that all the independent claims are in condition for allowance and all remaining claims properly depend from the independent claims, Applicants assert that all claims are allowable.

Applicants do not believe a request for extension of time is required but if it is, please accept this paragraph as a request for an extension of time and authorization to charge the requisite extension fee to Deposit Account No. 04-1696. Applicants do not believe any additional fees are due regarding this amendment. However, if any additional fees are required, please charge Deposit Account No. 04-1696.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: January 8, 2009



Christopher Paul Mitchell
Registration No. 54,946
Dugan & Dugan, PC
Hawthorne, New York
Attorneys for Applicants
(914) 579-2200